

REMARKS

Claims 1-12 were presented for examination and all claims were rejected. In the current amendment, claim 1 has been amended. No new matter has been introduced. Upon entry of the current amendment, claims 1-12 will be pending, of which claim 1 is independent. Applicants submit that claims 1-12 are patentable and in condition for allowance.

The following comments address all stated grounds of rejection. Applicants respectfully traverse all rejections and urge the Examiner to pass the claims to allowance in view of the remarks set forth below.

CLAIM OBJECTIONS

In the Office Action, claims 2, 3, 7, and 8 were objected to for informalities. Specifically, these claims referred to steps “c” and “d”. Applicants have amended claim 1 to restore these references and respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the objection to claims 2, 3, 7, and 8.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102**I. Claims 1-3 and 11 as Anticipated by Alford**

Claims 1-3 and 11 were rejected as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,027,051 to Alford, Jr. et al. (“Alford”) under 35 U.S.C. §102(e). Claim 1 is an independent claim. Claims 2, 3, and 11 depend upon and incorporate all of the patentable subject matter of independent claim 1. Applicants traverse this rejection and submit that Alford fails to disclose each and every feature of the claimed invention.

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. Independent claim 1 is

directed towards a method of presenting an aggregate view of native resources. The claims recite enumerating pluralities of system-scoped native resources provided by a system scope and application-scoped native resources provided by an application isolation scope. If an application-scoped resource exists that corresponds to a system-scoped resource, the application-scoped resource is included in the aggregate view. An application-scoped resource is clearly described in the specification as an instance of the resource separate from the system-scoped native resource, and is found in the application isolation scope (see specification, para. 76). For example, these separate instances may be created when an application attempts to open a resource and indicates that it is doing so with the intent to modify the resource (see specification, para. 80). The aggregated view thus includes both instances of native resources and instances of these resources specific to the application (see specification, para. 74). Alford fails to disclose each and every element of this claim.

Alford discloses neither application-scoped resources nor including an application-scoped resource in an aggregate view of resources. Alford describes a method of visualization of utilization of physical system resources used by all applications – specifically, the CPU, memory, and disk I/O (see Alford, abstract) for the purpose of monitoring a data center. The concept of creating instances of physical resources, such as a CPU, is nonsensical. Similarly, since Alford does not disclose application-scoped instances of resources, Alford cannot describe including them in an aggregate view.

For at least the above-discussed reasons, Alford fails to teach or suggest each and every element of independent claim 1. Thus, Applicants submit that independent claim 1 is patentable and in condition for allowance. Claims 2, 3, and 11 depend upon and incorporate all of the patentable subject matter of independent claim 1. Therefore, Applicants submit that claims 2, 3,

and 11 are also patentable and in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 1-3 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. §102.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103

II. Claims 4-10 and 12 Rejected under 35 USC §103(a)

Claims 4-6, 9, and 10 were rejected as unpatentable over Alford in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0249937 to Tachihara et al. ("Tachihara"). Claim 12 was rejected as unpatentable over Alford in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0230971 to Rachman et al. ("Rachman"). Claims 7-8 were rejected as unpatentable over Alford in view of Official Notice. Claims 4-10 and 12 depend upon and incorporate all of the patentable subject matter of independent claim 1. Applicants traverse these rejections and submit that Alford, Tachihara, and Rachman fail to teach or suggest each and every feature of the claimed invention.

To establish prima facie obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. As discussed above in connection with the rejection of independent claim 1, Alford fails to teach or suggest an application-scoped resource or including an application-scoped resource in an aggregate view of resources. The arguments presented above apply with equal force here and are reiterated as if set forth in full. The Examiner cites Tachihara for the purpose of describing user-scoped resources. However, like Alford, Tachihara merely teaches a monitoring system for displaying performance of shared physical system resources, "such as servers, applications, databases, network devices, and storage devices" (see Tachihara, para. 2). Again, Tachihara does not teach or suggest creating instances of native resources specific to an application because that concept is nonsensical for physical servers. Since neither Alford nor Tachihara, taken alone or in combination, teach or

suggest application-scoped resources or user-scoped resources, the rejection of claims 4-6, 9, and 10 as obvious in view of those references should be withdrawn.

The Examiner cites Rachman as describing enumerating a plurality of registry entries. Rachman merely describes a method of streaming software to a remote system and includes examining the target system to determine if objects already exist (see Rachman, para. 25). Rather than isolation, Rachman will reuse or share any application components that are already on the client system to reduce network bandwidth requirements. One skilled in the art reading Rachman and Alford would therefore share or reuse resources. This is distinct from the claimed invention, where application-scoped resources and user-scoped resources may only be available to that specific application or user and may not be available for sharing. Since neither Alford nor Rachman, taken alone or in combination, teach or suggest application-scoped resources or user-scoped resources, the rejection of claims 7-8 as obvious in view of those references should be withdrawn.

The Examiner takes Official Notice that it is well known in the art to modify a view to indicate a resource is deleted (see Office Action, page 8, para. 4). As discussed above in connection with the rejection of independent claim 1, Alford fails to teach or suggest an application-scoped resource or including an application-scoped resource in an aggregate view of resources. The Official Notice, combined with Alford, would still not lead one skilled in the art to contemplate an application-scoped resource provided by an application isolation scope or a user-scoped resource provided by a user isolation scope. Since neither Alford nor the Official Notice, taken alone or in combination, teach or suggest application-scoped resources or user-scoped resources, the rejection of claim 12 as obvious in view of those references should be withdrawn.

Because Alford, Tachihara, Rachman, and the Official Notice fail to teach or suggest each and every feature of the claimed invention, Applicants submit that independent claim 1 is patentable and in condition for allowance. Claims 4-10 and 12 depend upon and incorporate all of the patentable subject matter of independent claim 1. Therefore, Applicants submit that claims 4-10 and 12 are also patentable and in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of claims 4-10 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. §103.

CONCLUSION

In light of the aforementioned arguments, Applicants contend that each of the Examiner's rejections has been adequately addressed and all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration, withdrawal of all grounds of rejection, and allowance of all of the pending claims.

Should the Examiner feel that a telephone conference with Applicants' attorney would expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the Applicants' attorney at the telephone number identified below.

Respectfully submitted,

CHOATE, HALL & STEWART, LLP

Dated: May 4, 2009

/John D. Lanza/

John D. Lanza

Reg. No. 40,060

Attorney for Applicants

Choate, Hall & Stewart, LLP

Two International Place

Boston, MA 02110

(617) 248-5000